

The Report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders is a valuable and historic document. Its declaration that the problems of Negroes are caused by white racism is forthright and truthful; and its commitment to integration is both welcome and realistic.

One only hopes that the declarations of the Commission will end the long years of talk around these problems and move us on to unified and constructive action. Negroes, as the Report states, have known in their bones for many years the hard facts of their situation in America. Now that whites themselves have been bluntly confronted with the role they have played in creating and perpetuating this situation, there is nothing left for the entire society to do but to get to work on solutions. This ought to be the last Report of its kind in America.

I do, of course, have some criticisms of the Report, but what chiefly interests me at this point is that its major recommendations incorporate many of those that have been made over the past few years by the relevant civil rights and liberal leadership. Some of the recommendations:

- A national, comprehensive and enforceable open-occupancy law that applies to all housing.
- Development of a national system of income supplements to provide a basic floor for the economic and social security of all Americans.
- One million new jobs in the public sector of the economy over the next three years; and an additional million jobs in the private sector -- with the aid of government contracts or tax incentives.
- Six million new housing units within five years -- 600,000 to be built the first year.
- Elimination of the "man in the house" welfare rule, and scrapping of the one-year residency requirement for welfare recipients.
- Better teachers in ghetto schools and better trained and more compassionate policemen on ghetto streets.
- Limiting future federal education aid to those schools which have achieved a fixed level of integration.
- Neighborhood city halls where ghetto residents can get a sympathetic hearing and response to their problems.

- . A national gun-control law.
- . Expansion of the Head Start program to include younger children.
- . Expansion of most existing programs aimed at promoting integration and combatting poverty in the ghetto.

II

Some of the Report's recommendations are more effective than others: I heartily support some, but others appear to me to be inadequate and will not significantly remedy the present situation of Negroes. However, the recommendations that seem to be most significant are the ones that reflect a commitment to full employment, low cost new housing, and income maintenance.

The Report's major deficiencies in these areas are in its lack of cost-analysis, the slowness with which it urges implementation of programs, and its failure to call for the destruction of ghettos and construction of new towns. Also, with regard to full employment, the Report failed to declare unequivocally that the government must be the employer of first and last resort for the hard-core poor.

There is yet another aspect of the national problem that the Report seems to ignore. Our cities have been shamefully neglected: during the last few decades such public facilities as education, transportation, health, water supply, storm sewers, and waste disposal have been deteriorating. Under the prodding of the AFL-CIO, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress drew up an inventory of the needs in those areas and found them startling. The needs were so startling, in fact, that they will be effectively met only by a planned national effort with vigorous federal leadership and financial aid.

The Joint Economic Committee's inventory was entitled "State and Local Public Facility Needs and Financing," and is an excellent supplement to the President's Commission's Report. It seems to me that together they provide the basis for the major legislation and national planning that we need.

One of the strengths of the Joint Economic Committee's report is that it attempts to make some estimate of what it will take for us to meet our needs, and the benefits, particularly in terms of long-range employment, of in fact meeting those needs.

III

Let us look at a few specific problem areas and a rough estimate of what it will take to meet the needs in those areas:

EDUCATION: Over the next ten years, 750,000 new classrooms will have to be built if we are to cope with the present backlog of students, future deterioration, and expected increase in enrollment. What does this mean in terms of cost? It means an expenditure of \$5.3 billion in 1975, as compared with \$3.7 billion in 1965. And for elementary education alone, the cost over the entire ten years totals \$42 billion. Now higher education: If the growing demand for higher education is to be met, then state and local governments will have to spend \$13.9 billion for academic facilities during the next decade, and another \$6.1 billion to provide housing and related facilities for the students. Thus, expenditure for higher education will have to climb from approximately \$1.2 billion in 1964 to nearly \$2.5 billion in 1975.

TRANSPORTATION: To meet the needs estimated for 1975, spending for highways, roads, streets, bridges, tunnels, airports, marine facilities, mass transit, etc., will have to climb to nearly \$18 billion in that year. Mass transit is especially important if we are to open jobs up to Negroes in the suburbs and end the isolation of ghetto life.

PUBLIC FACILITIES: Whereas in 1965 we spent \$500 million on health facilities, by 1975 \$13 billion will be required if the health needs of our people are to be adequately met. Moreover in such areas as sewage and waste disposal, capital outlays will have to rise from \$385 million and \$625 million, respectively, to \$1.1 billion and \$1.2 billion, respectively, in 1975. In the area of public water supply, the needs projected for 1975 will require \$2.25 billion.

Writing in the March 1967 issue of the Federationist, AFL-CIO economist Marvin Friedman cogently sums up the significance of this inventory of American needs. Pointing out that the labor force will increase at the rate of 1.5 million per year in the next decade, Friedman goes on: "A logical policy would be to see to it that these two needs -- the growing need for jobs and the pressing need for public facilities -- are brought together in a planned program.

"The employment impact of these construction activities is substantial. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that each million dollars spent in this way creates approximately one hundred jobs for the year -- about forty jobs at the construction site and about sixty jobs in industries supplying building material, equipment and services,

including unskilled and semi-skilled jobs badly needed in an automated economy.

"Moreover, to this must be added the indirect impact -- that is, the impact felt as the result of the wages and salaries paid to these workers. As these wages and salaries are spent, retail sales are increased and still more jobs are created -- in stores and warehouses and in companies producing consumer goods. This adds another 50 to 100 full-time jobs.

"This would mean that a billion dollars spent on public facility construction is worth 100,000 jobs directly created on the construction site and in the production and distribution of equipment and material, plus somewhere between 50,000 to 100,000 more jobs as the result of increased sales to consumers."

Here, then, is what the AFL-CIO rightly calls "the foundation for a nationwide program...based on federal financial and technical assistance to the state and local governments, including federal grants-in-aid and guaranteed loans, as well as direct federal aids."

Let us turn now to the area of HOUSING. Nationally, America requires a housing goal of 2 1/2 million new dwelling units each year for the next ten years. There has been no significant or substantial construction since World War II. It follows, therefore, that there has been very little housing construction for low-income families since Negroes started migrating in larger numbers to the big cities.

Low-Income Housing: Rentals for poor families should be not more than \$40 - \$70 a month. Since the private enterprise cannot provide housing at such cost, public housing and public rehabilitation are essential. However in recent years the total number of new public dwelling units has been only about 30,000 - 40,000 per year. Urban renewal has, in fact, been tantamount to Negro removal. The urban renewal program which has bulldozed slum areas has concentrated mainly on the construction of commercial buildings and luxury high-rise apartments. Relocation of families has been neglected or ignored, and there has been virtually no replacement of low-rent housing. For these reasons, the Commission's estimate of 600,000 new units per year is a low estimate. I strongly support an adequate rent supplement program, but this program should be a supplement to, not a substitute for, a major effort to provide new and rehabilitated low-rent homes for low-income families.

Middle-Income: Another large-scale program is needed to provide decent housing for middle-income families -- such housing to range no higher in rental than \$85-\$135. Federal housing legislation should also make it possible for cooperatives

nonprofit and limited dividend corporations to acquire existing properties. And trade unions, limited dividend corporations, cooperatives and churches should be encouraged to take part in providing decent housing that lower middle-income families can afford.

We must have open housing. Residential restrictions against Negroes and other minority groups must be put to an end. No effort to rebuild our metropolitan areas can be meaningful without open housing. And no solution of our total housing grievances is possible unless all people, regardless of race, religion, or origin, have the legal right to buy or rent dwellings that they can afford.

Regarding urban renewal: The emphasis of this program must shift from the provision of expensive high-rise construction; the emphasis should instead be put on homes for lower and middle and lower income people, balanced neighborhoods, community facilities and services. Those families who are displaced by the elimination of slum housing must be helped to find decent accommodation at rents they can afford.

JOBS: The Riot Commission's Report falls short in the area of public service jobs as well, urging the creation of only 1 million jobs over the next three years. There is now before Congress a bill by Congressman O'Hara of Michigan and 76 associates to provide Federal, State and local agencies as well as non-profit organizations with the necessary funds to help them create one million public service jobs now for those who are unemployed or seriously underemployed. Senator Joseph Clark introduced a similar bill last summer but it was narrowly defeated. However, this year he has again introduced legislation calling for jobs and job training for 2.4 million hard-core unemployed over the next four years. I believe both Senator Clark's and Congressman O'Hara's bill should be supported. I am somewhat disappointed that the Commission did not recognize the existence of either piece of legislation.

IV

RURAL AND FARM POVERTY: Our farms and those who work on them have been sorely neglected. Millions of acres have been retired from production, and millions of people who make their living off the farms have been forced off the land. They have drifted into underemployment and poverty elsewhere. On a family or per capita basis, the concentration of poverty is about 2 1/2 times as high in agriculture as in nonfarm areas. Despite improvements in farm income during 1965, per capita farm income from all sources in 1965 was only \$1610, and per capita income from farm sources only \$1060, compare with per capita nonfarm income of \$2800.

In light of this situation, a long-range full-employment, production and purchasing power budget for agriculture is essential. The Freedom Budget for All Americans, published by the A. Philip Randolph Institute, develops such a farm budget. Its features are: 1) Goals to assure adequate, balanced and pleasant diets for the U.S. poor through expanded food stamp and other distributional programs. 2) Goals to eradicate farm poverty, and to bring farm families very close to parity of incomes with others by 1975. 4) And goals for improved public services in rural areas with respect to education, health, subsidized housing, and social security and welfare payments.

The achievement of these goals depends upon a complete reversal of recent and current attitudes toward farm outlays in Federal expenditure. Heretofore, most of the money spent under the farm program has not consumed our economic resources; it has merely distributed them so that the farm population has received a larger share than it otherwise would, even though a totally inadequate share. This has been beneficial to the rest of the society; it has protected the whole economy from the catastrophic declines in farm incomes and prices which used to spark general economic downturns.

Other related farm goals are: (a) Programs of resource conservation and replenishment to provide millions of jobs, and, as in the case of housing and urban renewal, to provide a high product of relatively less-skilled jobs. (b) Programs for the relief of "distressed areas" massive and comprehensive enough to embrace full-scale efforts at economic development.

V

COST ANALYSIS: We must have a time table and an analysis of what it would cost to institute programs in all of the foregoing areas with a view to ending poverty. There is no reason why the reasoning behind the Freedom Budget should not apply to programs outlined in the Riot Commission's Report and other programs mentioned in this paper.

The Freedom Budget is based on the assumption that an expenditure of only 6 percent of the national budget would suffice to realize specified goals.

The key to the 6 percent projection is an economic growth rate of 4 1/2 to 5 percent. According to Woodrow L. Ginsberg, the research head of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, such a growth rate is "highly feasible," given a burgeoning population, an improvement in output per man hour, and the will to utilize all our manpower. "It would not strain our manpower capacities," Ginsberg says, "and is

reasonable in light of early postwar experience as well as in most recent years."

As to financing, the economists who drew up the Freedom Budget (men like Leon Keyserling and Vivian Henderson) estimated that if its provisions were enacted, the federal government would receive an additional eight to ten billion dollars a year on the average during the next decade even without raising the rates which existed in October 1966. This sum, amounting to some 400 to 500 billion dollars more for the decade as a whole would more than cover the cost of the increased federal outlays called for by the program.

But would the program, or another like it, be inflationary? A look at our economic history may be helpful here. The two periods of serious inflation in recent times were World War II and its reconversion aftermath, and the Korean War era (1950-51 specifically). Those inflationary movements could have been checked much more effectively by higher taxes during World War II, a less precipitate ending of controls following the war, and by a prompter imposition of controls during the Korean war. But let us leave these matters aside. Nobody said during those wars that we should cut back on what we needed least. Today the President is attempting to raise taxes to pay for the war in Vietnam while cutting back on the war against poverty. It is a question of priorities, not of inflation, and in the present case the priorities are being set in an immoral and costly fashion.

Even before the Vietnamese war our national economic policies and our campaign against inflation served to redistribute income in the wrong direction -- to hurt those who needed help the most, and to help those most who did not need our help at all. Then, in the period 1962 through 1965, instead of investing in massive social programs, we cut taxes to stimulate the economy. Yet by 1966 there had emerged a growing recognition that the investment boom in plants and equipment had become excessive and now constituted the main inflationary danger. And no taxes were raised. No doubt a large part of our increased output and job opportunities resulted from the tax cut, but we could have been better served had a different balance between tax cuts and increased federal spending been achieved. If it should prove impossible to carry forward the priorities we have stressed without tax increases, we should increase taxes by whatever amount may be necessary. But the burden must be placed where it can easily be borne instead of being hung on the necks of the downtrodden.

IV

THE 1968 ELECTIONS AND THE SOUTH: All of this, naturally, has significance for the 1968 elections, since the passage of needed legislation to implement the Riot Commission's Report depends on our electing or re-electing a majority of liberal congressmen.

Perhaps the key to the election of such a liberal congress lies in the South. Negroes in the South can therefore play a major role in determining the outcome of the elections, as well as the future of social legislation, because this year more of them will be able to vote than at any time since the Reconstruction.

The chances of achieving massive social legislation will depend largely on whether the labor, liberal and civil rights movements can jointly remain at the center of a coalition whose political, economic and social objectives can bring about a reordering of our economic and social priorities.

This implies, of course, that white liberal and trade union workers will be expected to take substantially the same position regarding the outcome of the 1968 elections as the black population. It is only right that this should be so because the organized white worker and the unorganized white poor are exploited from the same quarters as are Negroes. They are, in different ways, both plagued by racism, the Negro as victim and the white working poor as helpless pawns in the economic and political interests of a demagogic racist system. The outcome is the same: white worker and white poor are set at the throats of black worker and black poor, while the exploitative interests of businessmen and politicians prosper.

Both black and white in the South are plagued by the conditions that multiply behind the aristocratic support of states' rights and callous opposition to federal programs. As long as states' rights are affirmed and federal programs opposed, it becomes more difficult to achieve programs for housing, public works, education, rural electrification and medical care.

As I said in a recent article in Commentary magazine, the civil rights movement has made great strides in winning the vote in the South and, by taking vantage of those victories, the southern Negro can now play an important part not only in remedying his own plight but in affecting the nature of American politics as well. It is true that only half of the eligible voters below the Mason-Dixon line are registered, but they have already begun to have an influence upon their region as Negroes sit in state legislatures and city councils for the first time since the Reconstruction. This should serve as an encouragement for a further intensive campaign to register and educate voters, for an increase in the percentage of Negro registrants will inevitably mean a growth of Negro political power.

This new political power, however, cannot by itself transform either the South or the rest of American politics. If will have, in the South as well as in the North, to seek out allies and create a new majority consisting of labor, liberal and other progressive forces.

From what we have been able to observe, and from some of our own experiences, there are no more promising allies of this new political power than the labor and liberal movements. And if Negroes were to register, organize themselves and make alliances with these two movements, then there could come about a powerful realignment of democratic politics that would be an effective counterbalance both to the reactionaries on the far right and the alliance of Dixiecrats and Republicans. Viewed in this perspective, a dynamic Negro political movement would make an enormous contribution to solving the problems of the black ghettos in the entire society. Such a political force cannot emerge without a clearly defined economic program for all Americans.

This was one of the thoughts in the mind of A. Philip Randolph when he insisted that the Freedom Budget be drawn up so that it would apply to every citizen and not just to Negroes. But the point has only begun to be made. And there is a crying need right now for Negroes to lay the basis for a qualitatively new civil rights thrust. Black people must ideed organize black people and assert their rightful power, but this can only be done if there is a serious, practical political strategy and a social and economic program.

But let me return to the implications of the 1968 elections. Next year, the United States comes to a fork in the road. We confront not just rhetorical but also real political and social prospects of returning to yesterday -- or, what amounts to the same thing, of standing still while the world keeps moving and our internal problems deepen.

Looking back over the past seven or eight years, we can see that far too little has been done to eradicate poverty and resolve the basic contradictions of the society. But important beginnings were made; historic commitments were undertaken -- in civil rights, poverty, minimum wages, education, civil liberties and so forth. Indeed, just to speak of the '60s in American life is to denote not only a point in time but a resurgent spirit of social reform.

It was not decreed from above by the Kennedy or Johnson Administrations. It emanated from concerted action by thousands, even millions of Americans. They were determined that this society should achieve justice and equality in the second half of the 20th Century. And the organized political base of this determination has been the labor-Negro-liberal coalition and the creative dynamism that emerged from activity in the South.

The achievements of the 1960s represent the greatest advances in social legislation since the New Deal, but no one suffers from the illusion that the gains have been adequate

(3)

to the need. In fact, the turmoil in our cities -- and the confusion in our political life -- are signs that, having made a beginning, we have not gone far enough. We have gone far enough to arouse expectations but not to satisfy them -- and that is a dangerous thing to do.

Nonetheless, it is hard for me to understand the view, now fashionable in some quarters, that to make more progress requires the denial of progress already made. This view not only dishonors our own struggles and the sacrifices they entailed; it also blurs political vision and saps political will. For if the gains of recent years are worthless, why bother to defend them against conservative and reactionary assaults?

But much more is involved in the 1968 elections than the preservation of past victories. The road ahead is much longer than the distance we have come. At stake is whether we shall travel that road, and at a faster pace, or be detoured onto a path that leads back whence we came.

This country boasts resources, human and technological, which no land in the history of mankind ever had or dreamed of having. We can perform miracles in practically every field. As we have sent vehicles to explore the atmosphere of Venus, so we can make devices to cleanse the atmosphere of our cities. We can not only abolish slums and poverty but reconstruct the face of the nation.

Will we build new slums into this second America, or decent, pleasant housing for all its inhabitants? Will we build 4 percent unemployment into this second America, or meaningful jobs with good pay for all? Will we build overcrowded, inferior and segregated schools into this second America, or quality, integrated education? Will public employees have the right to bargain collectively and to strike in this second America, or will an increasing number of workers be reduced to peonage for the state?

These questions will not be explicitly stated on the ballots in 1968, but they will be answered nonetheless, perhaps decisively for a generation.

The elections of 1968 may prove to be as crucial for the national destiny as the elections of 1860, 1876, and 1932. For the Negro, 1968 threatens the repetition of the fateful election of 1876 and the infamous Compromise of the following year -- when the federal government removed its remaining troops from the South, and the nation turned its back on the Negro.

The parallels are disconcerting. As in 1876, there is today among many whites a weariness and disillusionment with the cause of the Negro. As in 1876, when the conservatives exploited alleged excesses of Negro politicians in the Reconstruction governments, so today the riots are

used to deny the Negro an equal place in American society.

In 1876 they said: "We fought a bloody war to free the Negro. Must we also give him 40 acres and a mule? Today they say: 'We have given the Negro the right to eat at our lunch counters. Must we also give him a job so he can afford a hamburger? As Southerners know (better than the rest of us), had the answer been "Yes" in 1876, the question would not have arisen in 1967. And if it is not answered affirmatively in 1968, it will be with us in the year 2000.

I do not mean that a victory of the right wing in 1968 would lead to the reimposition of legal segregation and discrimination, or the disfranchisement of Negro voters. But it can bring the kind of social and economic stagnation in which the existing problems will fester and multiply. After all, although the Eisenhower Administration did not consciously legislate the slums into existence, the priorities and policies it followed encouraged the spread of, and further deterioration in, the slums of the nation.

The nation simply cannot afford -- and the Negro and labor least of all -- a return to conservative rule, even in its cleaned-up, well dressed, broad-grinned Madison Avenue varieties. We cannot afford four years of substituting clichés about the genius of private enterprise for intelligent and vigorous public policy. We cannot afford four years of rhetoric about states' rights -- North and South -- in place of massive federal action, of highway construction at the expense of mass transit, of subsidized suburban sprawl at the expense of urban reconstruction; of budget-balancing at the expense of starved school systems; of soaring profits at the expense of wages and salaries; of lucrative technological rampage at the expense of jobs and human dignity.

This prospect can -- and must -- be averted. Just as we possess enormous technological resources for social progress, so do we possess potentially overwhelming political resources for advancement. We have a powerful labor movement, the largest organized social force in the country. It has acquired increasing experience and sophistication in political and economic action in the past generation. It is on the verge of even greater growth, particularly in the South.

We have in the 10 percent of the population represented by the Negro people another consistent force for social reform. In the urban centers the Negro vote has proven decisive in important contests. And in the South, where Negro voting is on the rise, dramatic political shifts have taken place. The power of the Dixiecrats can now be undermined at its source.

We have seen a resurgence of liberalism in the middle classes among professional, technical, and academic people. Many religious groups have displayed an awareness of social problems, and the need for solving them, such as we have not seen in a very long time.

While many elements of middle-class liberalism are in a state of disarray and uncertainty, they nonetheless represent an enormous potential for progress in our political and social life. That potential will be severely tested in 1968. And the results depend largely on the ability of the labor, liberal and civil rights movements to project strong leadership around clear issues.

If all these forces could be brought together and united behind common objectives, then I am convinced they could prevail against all the obstacles to progress now being created. For proof, we need only look back to the historic victories of the liberal coalition between 1963 and 1965 -- including the smashing defeat of Barry Goldwater and the Dixiecrat Republican coalition of 1964.

But as powerful as the liberal forces can be, a number of factors have contributed to delaying or weakening the union among them that is indispensable for a sure -- and even easy -- victory for all of us.

The first factor is the Viet Nam war. The tragedy here is not that there are disagreements over the purposes and conduct of the war, for such disagreements are inevitable in so complex a war. It is, rather, that the disagreements threaten to weaken the liberal coalition in its struggle for domestic progress. Thus, instead of resisting conservative efforts to use the war as an excuse for cutting back the war on poverty, many liberals are fighting among themselves and with the labor movement.

Indeed, some liberals unwittingly assist the rightwing by arguing that such programs as the "Freedom Budget" must be shelved until the war in Viet Nam is over. Only their proposals for ending the war distinguish these liberals from Senator Dirksen.

The second factor weakening our coalition grows out of the riots, the disunity within the civil rights movement and the white backlash.

The divisions within the civil rights movement are irreconcilable. They cannot, should not and must not be glossed over, patched up or concealed in the interest of preserving the facade of unity. Some important disagreements existed all along, but they did not challenge the fundamental principles on which the movement was based -- democracy, integration, opposition to racism in all its form. These principles are today rejected and their advocates reviled by a fresh cove of adventurist demagogues and apostles of violence who claim to speak for the black masses but consistently demonstrate their inability to attract or organize mass support. For such support they substitute

intimidation, sensationalism and authoritarian political styles. And, in making this substitution, they have the full cooperation of the mass media.

It would be a mistake, however, to dismiss the Van Browns and Stokely Carmichaels, for they do articulate the growing frustration, anger and bitterness of the ghettos. These feelings have been created by broken promises, by the failure of government programs to live up to their rhetoric. The rightwing will exploit this failure; it will call for the promises to be revoked. All of us must see to it that the promises are fulfilled.

Throughout the Negro's struggle, the labor and liberal forces have been obvious and natural allies: the enemies of one have traditionally been the enemies of other. Now that the Negro's struggle for legal and constitutional rights has largely been won, and his attention has turned toward social and economic equality, his alliance with labor movement becomes more crucial. For while he finds that many groups in society are prepared to support his constitutional right, the labor and liberal movements are preeminent among those who believe that he has a right to a job, good pay, a decent home, quality education and the other good things in life.

More needs to be done, however, to educate Negroes and liberals as to labor's economic program. The Wall Street Journal has already noted with satisfaction that underlying the strident Black Power ideology is an economic conservatism with which big business should be sympathetic. The emphasis is on self-help and local initiative, as against political action and national economic policies. It is not surprising that the Black Power Conference in Newark was financed by Bell Telephone and other large corporations. Another company advertises in a full page that its hiring practices are "the American Way to Black Power." Needless to say, these activities are coupled with a propaganda campaign which blames the unions for discrimination in employment.

The discontent in our black communities, if it is not to take a politically as well as literally destructive form, must be channeled into constructive action for economic reform. The "Freedom Budget," which embodies the Negro and labor economic program, is a start, but more needs to be done to counteract conservative propaganda and the pseudo-economics of Black Power.

Even more important, no doubt, is the educational work that must be done in the white community and among trade union rank and file, as well as among Negroes gaining the franchise in the South. This is not an easy task: I do not have the final answer as to how to go about it.

But somehow it must be done. The white worker must be made to look behind the riots and beyond the Rap Browns to the essential, underlying economic and political interests which bind him, as a white American, to the Negro's aspirations.

And so the nation moves toward 1968, a year of historic importance, in a mood of confusion, unrest and uncertainty. Exploiting Viet Nam and the Negro's agony, the rightwing prepares to launch a comeback. If successful, it will profoundly alter the direction of American politics and most grievously set back the Negro. What it has neither talent nor power to do is to resolve the fundamental problems in American society. It can only prolong and exacerbate them: it can only twist the country out of shape.

There is no alternative to the programs that liberals, labor and civil rights forces propose and which they are committed to fight for. And the country has no choice but to implement the recommendations, and similar ones, made by the President's Commission on Civil Disorders.

VII

In 1965, Whitney M. Young of the National Urban League called for a domestic "Marshall Plan for the elimination of poverty in our society. One of those who welcomed Mr. Young's proposal was Mr. A. Philip Randolph who immediately called together a number leading liberals and economists to formulate a broad program that would include a cost analysis. This program was published in October of 1966 as the Freedom Budget for all Americans.

We still believe that a series of disconnected projects, lacking a total overall planning and realistic cost analysis may in the long run do as much harm as good, since such an approach raises aspirations beyond the capability of such piecemeal methods to meet them.

Therefore, we reaffirm the major proposals of the Freedom Budget which were:

1. To provide full employment for all who are willing and able to work, including those who need education or training to make them willing and able.
2. To assure decent and adequate wages to all who work.
3. To assure a decent living standard to those who cannot or should not work.

4. To wipe out slum ghettos and provide decent homes for all Americans.
5. To provide decent medical care and adequate educational opportunities to all Americans, at a cost they can afford.
6. To purify our air and water and develop our transportation and natural resources on a scale suitable to our growing needs.
7. To unite ~~sustained full employment~~ with sustained full production and high economic growth.

The Commission Report now gives all of us an opportunity within a new framework to push vigorously for the total elimination of poverty and racism in this society. And we believe every individual and group in the society can play a role in using this report for the achievement of those ends.

We therefore recommend the following forms of action:

1. That the urban coalitions and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights should be encouraged to introduce legislation for the implementation of the recommendations of this report.

2. That Congress be pressured to act on a national scale, since no city or state has adequate funds to meet the demands made in the report.

3. That the 47 liberal Congressmen and the 3 liberal Senators who were defeated in the 1966 elections be re-elected. Their defeat in 1966 remains the significant difference between the very creative 89th Congress and the 90th which has cut back on fundamental programs. Therefore no group or individual can argue that there is nothing to be done to encourage implementation. The job is to work in the areas of voting and voter registration. And the aim should be not only to replace the 50 liberals who were defeated in 1966, but also to elect additional liberals to Congress.

4. That the President be asked to enlist the power and prestige of his office in support of the recommendations. And also that the society should pressure the President to introduce legislation in behalf of the recommendations.

5. This report gives all concerned an opportunity to conduct a balanced election campaign, emphasizing not only international but also domestic issues. One of the greatest tragedies of the present campaign would be if we permitted it to become a single issue -- Vietnam -- campaign. Therefore, pressure should be put on all candi-

3

dates to state their views clearly on the implementation of this report. It is imperative that we avoid the fiasco of 1952 when Mr. Eisenhower was elected on a single issue campaign -- stop the war in Korea. At that time Mr. Eisenhower interpreted his tremendous plurality as a mandate exclusively related to international questions. And for eight years he did practically nothing on domestic issues affecting poverty and racism. Those eight years of inaction contributed substantially to the present crisis in which the society now finds itself.

#